IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : CRIMINAL NOS. 16-130-1, 2

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania November 27, 2017 V.

11:50 o'clock a.m.

CHARLES M. HALLINAN (1) WHEELER K. NEFF (2)

EXCERPT OF JURY TRIAL BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDUARDO C. ROBRENO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Wheeler K. Neff:

MARK B. DUBNOFF, ESQUIRE For the Government:

JAMES A. PETKUN, ESQUIRE U.S. Attorney's Office 615 Chestnut Street

Suite 1250

Philadelphia, PA 19106

For the Defendant EDWIN J. JACOBS, JR., ESQUIRE

Charles M. Hallinan: Jacobs and Barbone 1125 Pacific Avenue

Atlantic City, NJ 08401

For the Defendant CHRISTOPHER D. WARREN, ESQUIRE

1730 North Fifth Street

Suite 604

Philadelphia, PA 19122

DENNIS J. COGAN, ESQUIRE Dennis J. Cogan & Associates

2000 Market Street

Suite 2925

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Laws Transcription Service 48 W. LaCrosse Avenue Lansdowne, PA 19050 (610)623-4178

ESR Operator: Nelson Malave

Transcribed by: Geraldine C. Laws, CET

(Proceedings recorded by For the Record Gold digital sound recording; transcript provided by AAERT-certified transcriber.)

```
3
              (The following excerpt occurred at 11:50 o'clock
 1
 2
     a.m.)
 3
              THE COURT: Okay, please be seated. So, Mr. Jacobs,
 4
     two issues. Let's deal with the forfeiture first. What's
 5
     your thinking as to how you would like to proceed in terms of
 6
     timing?
 7
              MR. JACOBS: Judge, I think the forfeiture issues
 8
     are fairly complex and I think the forfeiture list is over 20
 9
     assets. So, I would ask the Court to set aside a couple of
10
     days for hearings on forfeiture. I don't know the Court's
11
     calendar, but I do know that I'll be back in trial in Federal
12
     Court in New York in early January.
13
              THE COURT: Well, I don't know what the Government's
14
     is, but I think that we would want to address these issues
15
    more promptly than that. We don't have to do it today, but
16
     can we do them later this week?
              MR. JACOBS: Later this week would be difficult to
17
18
     muster our proofs in that short a period of time, Judge.
              THE COURT: Okay.
19
20
              MR. JACOBS: I would suggest perhaps the following
21
     week.
22
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. WARREN: That's fine, Judge.
23
              THE COURT: Okay, let me ask the Government.
24
25
              MR. DUBNOFF: Yes, your Honor. We'd be fine to
```

4 proceed next week. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay and you said you would need a 3 couple of days? 4 MR. JACOBS: I think so, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Now, one of the possibilities may be 6 that that also would afford the parties an opportunity to 7 discuss these assets. There may be some agreement on some 8 and not on others. 9 MR. JACOBS: Yes. 10 THE COURT: And refine what the issues are and 11 submit papers to you. I think that if we go forward, it's 12 probably more likely that it will be not next week, but the 13 week after. That would be the week of December 12th. 14 MR. DUBNOFF: That's fine with us, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Vance will check with you 16 more specifically. Because I would like to have then some 17 papers submitted to me and you would do that. 18 Now, it would seem to me that while we wait for 19 that, is the Government requesting any interim orders on 20 these assets? 21 MR. DUBNOFF: If I may consult with --22 THE COURT: Yes. MR. DUBNOFF: -- USA Carillo. 23 24 THE COURT: Yes, let's have her join you here. 25 MR. DUBNOFF: All right, I'm going to relinquish my

5 1 seat. 2 THE COURT: Yes, fine. So, Ms. Carillo, what's your 3 thinking here? MS. CARILLO: Good morning, your Honor. 4 5 Government will be prepared to proceed on forfeiture. 6 THE COURT: Now, are you requesting any interim 7 orders concerning any of these assets? 8 MS. CARILLO: Presently, your Honor, all but one 9 asset is restrained and we would ask that that restraining 10 order continue in place until --11 THE COURT: Do I have to enter an order or does that 12 order carry forward? 13 MS. CARILLO: That order carries forward. 14 THE COURT: Okay, so I don't need to do anything. 15 All we have to do is then schedule a date and how long will 16 your case take, assuming that all the assets are in play? 17 MS. CARILLO: Your Honor, I believe I can present 18 the Government's case in approximately three hours. 19 THE COURT: Okay and what would that consist of? 20 MS. CARILLO: It would consist of testimony by 21 Special Agent Susan Rohrer (ph) and the submission of some 22 additional exhibits, mostly summary exhibits. 23 THE COURT: Okay, fine. And we'll need findings of 24 facts and conclusions of law or it this a general -- general 25 verdict?

```
6
              MS. CARILLO: Your Honor, it is. Your Honor will
 1
 2
     want to support your position with findings of fact, yes.
              THE COURT: Okay, so you will submit some findings
 3
 4
     of fact? I don't think you have.
 5
              MS. CARILLO: I have not and I can certainly do
 6
     that.
 7
              THE COURT: Okay, good. Mr. Jacobs, what's your
 8
     thinking here?
 9
              MR. JACOBS: Well, as to the timing, that's
10
     agreeable.
11
              THE COURT: Okay.
12
              MR. JACOBS: And if the Government intends to submit
13
    proposed findings of fact, that might expedite the process
14
     you've described of discussing forfeiture agreements.
15
              THE COURT: Okay, fine. So, I'll enter a scheduling
16
     order. Maybe you can submit proposed findings of fact by the
17
     end of the week and that will give you an opportunity next
18
     week to discuss these matters as to what the issues are and
19
     then by the end of the week, the defendants can submit their
20
     proposed finding of facts and conclusions of law, so that
21
     we'll be prepared to go the following week.
22
              MS. CARILLO: Very well, your Honor.
23
              THE COURT: So, if that's all right with everybody
24
     we'll enter an order to that extent. Now, finally, it's
25
          What is the Government's position on bail?
    bail.
```

MR. DUBNOFF: Your Honor, the Government moves to revoke bail and remand both defendants into custody.

MR. DUBNOFF: A number of things, your Honor. Both defendants are facing jail sentences under the United States Sentencing Guidelines that have ranges of upwards of ten years as floors. My preliminary calculation of Mr. Neff's sentence, in particular, was a floor of 14 years. I cannot recall what Mr. Hallinan's floor was under the guidelines, but I remember it being more than a decade, as well. We have, with Mr. Hallinan, a defendant who did not comply with your Honor's previous bail order. Not just by communicating with Mr. Gray and Mr. Klein by e-mail, there was a telephone conversation between Mr. Hallinan and Mr. Klein, as well. Both individuals were identified as potential witnesses.

You have in Mr. Hallinan's case, as well, an individual who, knowing that the Government was trying to contact Mark Kabash (ph) for potential testimony before the Grand Jury, he reached out to Mr. Kabash on the day of his Grand Jury testimony. And we've also seen the entire Lisa Mathewson episode where he was essentially paying Randall Ginger or paying the legal fees for Randall Ginger to try to block the Grand Jury's investigation and prosecution of this case. So, you have in Mr. Hallinan an individual who has taken a fair number of steps to try to impede justice and to

violate your Honor's order.

With regard to Mr. Neff, there are a couple of things. First of all, Mr. Neff testified on the stand for four days. Clearly, the jury did not credit his testimony. In light of the verdict, they must have found him to be not credible with many aspects of his testimony. In short, he lied on the witness stand, your Honor. There is no representation that he could make that would support him staying out on bail. We do not believe any representation he would make to the effect that he would comply with your Honor's orders would be credible. So, for those reasons —

THE COURT: Now, what is the evidence that there would be a risk of flight or that there would be a danger to others or to themselves?

MR. DUBNOFF: Well, we don't have any evidence to suggest that there is a danger to themselves. I have no information regarding that. The risk of flight analysis changes dramatically. Right now, they have substantial incentive to flee. Both men are now aware that they are likely looking at a very lengthy jail term if they stay within the district. I would note, your Honor, that in the Tucker case, both Mr. Tucker and Mr. Muir had their conditions change. I believe they are both on home confinement with electronic monitor and we would be recommending that, but for Mr. Hallinan's efforts to obstruct

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

justice and his defiance of your Honor's previous orders and Mr. Neff's perjury on the witness stand.

So, there is a different situation here, your Honor. At the very least, their movements should be restricted given the sentences that they are facing, the likelihood of flight. And frankly, your Honor, they have been fleeing justice, especially Mr. Hallinan's case, in some regard or another for more than a decade and it is time for them to start.

THE COURT: What do you mean by that?

MR. DUBNOFF: Well, what I mean is that for a while there were efforts to hold them accountable civilly. is still a lawsuit pending in Florida, which is from 1999, that's the Betz lawsuit for which we just introduced the docket sheet. There are -- there have been efforts to hold them accountable civilly by plaintiffs in California, by plaintiffs in New Mexico, by the New York Attorney General's Office, by plaintiffs in Indiana. And he has managed to evade justice for more than a decade, your Honor and he has, just by count of the Indiana fraud alone, 1,393 victims. the calculations of Mr. Smith of Intercept, which you know he went over with Mr. Jacobs as to what the math was. You have \$1.4 million people or \$1.4 loans that were processed. We don't know the precise numbers of the people who were in the states where the loans were illegal. But the law of averages says it has to be hundreds of thousands and those

admissions from Mr. Neff, at the trial, that he used that

```
11
    particular piece of property to found 5th Avenue, Palmetto,
 1
     Sable and I believe some other companies that are part of the
 2
     RICO enterprise. So, that particular piece of property may
 3
     be subject to forfeiture. We're certainly going to seeking
 4
 5
     forfeiture and be relying, at least in part, on Mr. Neff's
 6
     own admissions on the witness stand. So, I don't believe
 7
     that particular property is going to be available for Mr.
 8
    Neff for much longer.
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Jacobs, please?
10
              MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Judge. Firstly, Judge,
     sentencing guideline calculations are what they are there,
11
12
     all advisory now and the ultimate position in this case is up
             And you will be passing --
13
     to you.
14
              THE COURT: There's no mandatories here?
15
              MR. JACOBS: That's correct.
              THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
              MR. JACOBS: And you'll be passing sentencing on a
18
     69 and a 70 year old -- 76 year old person with no prior
19
     records, criminal history one, and so on. The New York case
20
     is a parallel, it is not precedent, it's not binding. Mr.
21
     Muir, the lawyer, did testify in that case, was disbelieved
22
    by the jury. That judge -- that Federal Judge in New York
23
     did change the bail, but the extent of it was electronic
```

Mr. Hallinan has been under indictment for 18

24

25

monitoring in their homes.

```
12
    months, under supervision of pre-trial services. They made
 1
 2
     no negative report to you about any of the things, I've
 3
     understood, that Mark is now arguing. There is no evidence
 4
     of a flight or a danger risk. None at all.
 5
     speculation, but with passport surrenders and home
 6
     confinement, electronic monitoring, there really is no risk
 7
     at all. Counsel may --
 8
              THE COURT: What's the amount of the bail in this
 9
     case?
10
              MR. JACOBS: It is a property bail. I don't have it
11
     here in court with me. It's - we posted property with values
12
     in the millions of dollars.
13
              THE COURT: Do you have any idea what it is?
14
              MR. DUBNOFF: I don't recall. Oh, it looks like -
15
              JUANITA GOMEZ: Your Honor, two days ago in this -
16
              THE COURT: Why don't you come here, Ms. Gomez?
17
              All right.
              JUANITA GOMEZ: Your Honor, Charles Hallinan's bail
18
19
     which was set April 7th, 2016 was $500,000 secured by
20
     property located at 641 Springdale Road, Villanova, PA. And
21
    Mr. Wheeler Neff, his bail amount was $250,000 secured by
22
     property. Also posted - I'm sorry, that one was posted April
23
     7th, 2016.
```

24 THE COURT: So 500,000 and 250,000, right?
25 JUANITA GOMEZ: Yes, sir.

1 THE COURT: And what has been their conduct during 2 the pretrial portion of this case? 3 JUANITA GOMEZ: Your Honor, Charles Hallinan is being 4 supervised in the Southern District of Florida. His 5 compliance there has, according to the officer there, Mr. 6 Goldberg, no issues at all. And the same with Wheeler Neff 7 who's been supervised in the District of Delaware by Officer 8 Carmichael, and he too says there are no issues with 9 complying with bail conditions. 10 THE COURT: Okay, very good. Thank you, Ms. Gomez. Now, are there any additional properties that are 11 12 not the subject to the forfeiture requests? 13 MR. JACOBS: Any additional properties which might be 14 available for collateral? 15 THE COURT: Exactly. 16 MR. JACOBS: I'd have to confer with my client, 17 Judge. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. JACOBS: I do not know. 20 THE COURT: Very good. So I get your point. 21 MR. WARREN: Judge, obviously I'll be joining Mr. 22 Jacobs in March. My client has complied with all conditions 23 of bail. I would also note that as Mr. Jacobs pointed out, 24 Mr. Muir who was convicted up in New York was also granted

bail despite the fact that he testified and the jury's

verdict indicated that they rejected -

THE COURT: Well, we have to look at the circumstances of this particular case.

MR. WARREN: Correct

THE COURT: I don't know to what extent that their risk of flight or danger to others bears upon this case. What about the Government's argument that perjury was committed, that obviously the jury did not believe Mr. Neff's testimony, so any representation that he makes now should not be believed by the Court.

MR. WARREN: Well, Judge, again there's no indication that he's a risk of flight, okay? He certainly -- I don't think the Government is contending that perjury somehow makes you a danger to the community. So the question would be whether or not the jury's rejection of his testimony indicates that he's a risk of flight.

And the only argument on that score that they've come up with is the one that Mr. Jacobs just addressed, the fact that he's looking at a hefty sentence under the guidelines. But as Mr. Jacobs pointed out, that is a recommendation. There are no mandatory minimums. House arrest with electronic monitoring would certainly address — I don't believe that's even necessary, Judge. He showed up every — where's he going to go? He doesn't have a passport. His entire life is in Delaware. There is nowhere for him to

THE COURT: Okay, very well.

Well, it seems to me that the Government has not carried its burden in this particular case that either one of either one of the defendants would be a risk of flight or a danger to others. However, I do recognize that the circumstances have changed. There has been a jury verdict. The evidence in the case was considerable, if not overwhelming. And therefore that should also enter into the Court's calculus.

I think that the appropriate conditions will be as follows: We will double the amount of bail and release the defendant, Hallinan, in \$1,000,000 bail, and we will give him 14 days to provide collateral on that amount of bail. That will coincide with the discussion on the forfeited properties, so we'll be able to see which ones are subject to forfeiture and which ones may be available for collateral.

Mr. Neff likewise will be released in home confinement subject to electronic monitoring. But the amount of bail will be increased from 250,000 to 500,000. All other conditions will remain the same.

Now, Mr. Hallinan is being supervised in the Southern District of Florida. Mr. Neff is being supervised in he District of Delaware. What's your view of whether or not that should continue to be the case? I understand Mr. Hallinan has a residence here in Pennsylvania?

17 1 MR. JACOBS: Yes. MR. DUBNOFF: Either one is fine, whether it's the 2 3 Villanova residence or the Boca Raton residence. 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 MR. DUBNOFF: Let me just check with Maria for one 6 second. 7 (Discussion off the record.) 8 MR. DUBNOFF: Your Honor, in light of the fact that 9 the Florida place is actually subject to the notice of 10 forfeiture, our position is that if there's going to be home 11 confinement of Mr. Hallinan, it should be to the Villanova 12 property. THE COURT: That's not subject to -13 14 MR. DUBNOFF: It is not. It may be sought as a 15 substitute asset down the road, but for right now it is not 16 subject to any of the notices of forfeiture. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Well, we will then confine him to the Villanova residence. I think that could evolve as your 18 19 discussions move forward as to whether or not that would be 20 the permanent place. But it should then be the place where 21 he will be confined at least for the next 14 days. 22 Now, pretrial, when can we make arrangements for this matter, landline, et cetera. 23

JUANITA GOMEZ: Your Honor, we don't need a landline.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm old fashioned, I guess, huh?

24

18 1 JUANITA GOMEZ: We used to. 2 THE COURT: Yeah. 3 JUANITA GOMEZ: We no longer need a landline for the installation -4 5 THE COURT: So you can do this this afternoon? 6 JUANITA GOMEZ: We can do this today, yes. 7 THE COURT: Okay, very well. 8 JUANITA GOMEZ: With respect to the home confinement 9 are we putting him on detention, home detention? 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 JUANITA GOMEZ: Okay. 12 THE COURT: He would only be permitted to leave his 13 residence for purposes of conferring with counsel, medical 14 reasons or religious obligations upon prior approval of 15 pretrial services, right? JUANITA GOMEZ: Yes. 16 17 THE COURT: And we'll enter an order to that effect 18 today. 19 Anything else today? 20 MR. DUBNOFF: Not from the Government, your Honor. 21 MR. JACOBS: Nothing, Judge. 22 MR. WARREN: Nothing from me, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Now, one final point. The exhibits that 24 were introduced as evidence in trial, each party shall take 25 custody of those exhibits as officers of the Court and

```
19
   preserve their integrity in the event that they're needed for
1
   post-trial proceeding or appeals.
2
3
             MR. DUBNOFF: Yes, sir.
4
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
5
             MR. DUBNOFF: Thank you, your Honor.
6
             COURT CLERK: All rise.
7
             (Here ends the requested excerpt of jury trial at
8
   12:14 o'clock p.m.)
```

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

s:/Geraldine C. Laws, CET Date 12/12/17 Laws Transcription Service